

wrote in a newsletter for the Competitive Enterprise Institute: "The debate will be tilted with endless factoids and pleadings. But ... when the commissioners finally sit down to assess the media marketplace, they will remember these days in March, and the cornucopia of information and perspectives that the market provided."

Viacom Corp., which owns CBS, Paramount Pictures, MTV and Black Entertainment Television; Rupert Murdoch's News Corp.; and Chicago-based Tribune Co., whose three dozen TV stations, radio stations and newspapers include The Baltimore Sun, are among the conglomerates lobbying to change the rules.

They are opposed by an assortment of public-interest groups, organized labor, movie stars and screenwriters who fear condensed power in Hollywood and other media companies that don't own multiple stations or intend cross-ownership of TV and newspapers.

The opponents argue that news outlets in fewer hands threatens the public's ability to know about news, especially on local issues.

The argument isn't new. The Supreme Court upheld the diversity model in 1943, arguing that The Associated Press couldn't discriminate in providing its wire service to local news outlets. But the question was reopened in 1996 when Congress required the FCC to justify its rules every two years.

Coverage of the Iraq war may not change the thinking of those most involved in the issue, especially because billions of dollars in broadcast revenue weigh in the balance. But the war reporting is something very tangible for a subject that often seems so esoteric that most Americans remain unaware an argument is being waged vigorously on their behalf.

Lawmakers, media executives and others who have argued that the protections against media concentration have become outmoded by technology couldn't have penned a better script than the digicammed, cell-phoned, cyber-coverage in Iraq, some say. "I almost felt bad about myself when I went to the Drudge Report for news," said Philip Napoli, a media professor at Fordham University in New York, who nevertheless marveled that he was able to access the Web site of muckraking reporter Matt Drudge when he tired of watching the cable news outlet CNN.

"It's one more case history that illustrates the fact that we live in a new media marketplace," said R. Clark Wadlow, a Washington attorney whose clients include Tribune Co., which is pursuing a policy of owning television and newspaper outlets in several major markets. "It certainly illustrates the point that everyone has a wide array of choices whether they live in New York or Martha, Texas."

Unlike what happened in an FCC vote on telephone deregulation last winter, when the interests of the influential regional Bell companies became mired in a political split on the commission, the media vote figures to split along party lines and favor the industry powers.

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin isn't expected to split with his fellow Republicans, Kathleen Q. Abernathy and Powell, as he did on the telephone vote.

Henry Geller, a former FCC counsel who wrote some of the media-ownership rules and favors their continuation, said he isn't optimistic that will happen given the agreement between the Republican commissioners and corporate interests.

"The other vote was this huge powerful struggle between various elements of telecom. All you have on the other side of this debate are a bunch of consumer groups. It's like saying, 'How many divisions does the pope have?'" he said. "Sept. 11 didn't repeal the First Amendment, but it tended to strengthen the Republicans who believed in getting rid of the regulations all along."

Many of those who support the current rules, however, believe their argument has been girded, not undercut, by the war coverage.

MoveOn, a large antiwar group that coalesced over the Internet after the Sept. 11 attacks, has criticized the American media for, in its view, not sufficiently showing the carnage and civilian casualties in Iraq.

"Embedded? or In Bed?" read a sign at a war protest last week at New York's Rockefeller Center, home of NBC-TV and The Associated Press.

"What's so interesting is the stark comparison of coverage from elsewhere and the U.S. TV networks, especially since the networks have their hand out right now for the Bush administration to grant them this change," said Jeff Chester, executive director of the Center for Digital Democracy, a public-interest group in Washington.

"Just because the Internet exists does not mean we should have to go outside our borders to get serious in-depth news coverage," Chester said. "We only have a half-dozen broadcast companies left standing, and that's why we're getting cookie-cutter coverage -- all former generals all the time. We need a new policy with many voices and channels while we're moving in the other direction."

The tentacles of war, already reaching into the economy and international diplomacy, may wrap around media policy yet.

Bruce M. Owen, an economist at Stanford University and formerly at the Justice Department who has consulted for the FCC, said: "I think this could have a heavy impact on showing that regulation is no longer necessary."

From: Polly Painter Eggers
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/8/03 2:01PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Polly Painter Eggers(willohwhisp@aol.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,
After watching Bill Moyers excellent program NOW regarding the FCCs desire to deregulate the FCC even further than it already is, I'm writing you to voice my concern and adamant opposition to this, as well as to ask for advice on how to prevent the current administration from steamrolling their way toward another debacle.

Sincerely yours
Polly Painter Eggers,
Tolland, CT

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.188.209.76
Remote IP address: 205.188.209.76

From: Jeff Hansen
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/8/03 2:17PM
Subject: Junes decision on mergers and acquisitions

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I write this e-mail after watching a program on PBS which concerned a pending June decision allowing more mergers of mega-media corporations and makes it easier for them to buy other smaller independent radio, tv and newspapers. This concerns me greatly as more then a way to make more money this will allow a few to control information, what we see, read and hear and therefore what we think, to be able to manipulate us. It was apparent how Mr. Powell is going to vote on the matter, but let me remind you, it is this very information and from many diverse sources which is the foundation of our democracy. An informed decision of the masses comes only after differing ideas have come forward into the light of public scrutiny where an educated public can make good choices. We are suppose to be the stewards of democracy, it's embarrassing that I along with so many others, listen and watch the BBC for real non propaganda information. We are already manipulated enough by corporations, groups, organizations who would rather us fall in line and think how they wish us to. Clear Channel owns radio, a few mega media corporations own TV and independent newspapers are hard to find. Even if you completely agree with their message I implore you, it is our airways, foster diversity, it is what insures our democratic republic.

Respectfully,
Jeff Hansen

From: Hansen
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/8/03 5:22PM
Subject: We Vote No to Deregulation of Media Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

My husband and I are concerned about protecting the diversity of news and information that the American public needs and deserves.

The 1945 Supreme Court decision (Associated Press v. United States) maintains that mergers that narrow the dissemination of information are unconstitutional.

The deregulatory effort of the 1990s in the electricity and telecommunications industries has upset this delicate balance between private interest and public responsibilities.

Already we can see that the news divisions of the media cartel appear to work against the public interest -- and for their parent companies, their advertisers and the Bush Administration. The situation is completely un-American. It is the purpose of the press to help us run the state, and not the other way around. As citizens of a democracy, we have the right and obligation to be well aware of what is happening, both in "the homeland and the wider world. Without such knowledge we cannot be both secure and free. We therefore must take steps to liberate the media from oligopoly, so as to make the government our own.

The long-standing rules on media concentration made sense yesterday, and they make sense today

A nation of monopolies is not in the best interest of this country

Kimberly and Rick Hansen

From: Susan Hoover
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/8/03 8:33PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Susan Hoover (cactusman@theriver.com) writes:

I just became aware that the FCC is considering changing or possibly eliminating the regulations concerning media concentration and that a very small number of public hearings are being held. What's more, the media is not making this known to the public or publicizing these meetings. This highlights the reasons that these regulations are necessary. If only a handful of large corporations control all of the nation's media outlets, all news and information will be presented in distinctly slanted formats designed to reinforce their particular views. Even now it is difficult to get a clear picture of current events by watching listening reading a variety of news sources.

That the FCC would even consider this move frightens and astounds me. Diverse and varied ideas and opinions are the foundation of our democratic process. Any government action that would limit or infringe upon this process, as I see it, would endanger our American way of life.

Please do more to bring this issue into public view, so that all Americans have ample opportunity to make their views known.

Thank you,

Susan Hoover

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.39.186.99
Remote IP address: 216.39.186.99

From: M. Norman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/8/03 11:35PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

M. Norman (nuclearnorm@hotmail.com) writes:

Thank you for your hard work in the FCC. The concerns you expressed in the Rick Karr interview were promising. One thing missing was the impact the duopoly rulings immediately had on the local level for announcers and techs. Multiple ownership in a market removed the competition, therefore the bargaining tool for announcers to negotiate wages. So for these working class subcontractors the result became a minimum wage job opportunity. Relocating to a different market is not a remedy because the big conglomerates own those stations too. The job advancement opportunity for DJs/announcers/operators had been based on the response of the listening public to the radio personality, which fueled the competition in the marketplace. With the relaxed ownership rules there is no monetary/market reward for the announcer who works to serve the listening public. In fact, the response of the public is eliminated when one company owns every station in a market. Likewise, without competition for! advancement, the industry reduced the broadcasting jobs to a minimum wage dead end. This has been a real blow for the working class job market and one that has been grossly ignored. The rest of the public trust issues for information gathering you covered very well on the PBS program. Thank you for your diligence in this matter. I am a taxpaying, voting, concerned American citizen. M. Norman - Washington State.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.81.26.166
Remote IP address: 198.81.26.166

From: Vera V Zlatarski
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 3/31/03 7:15PM
Subject: protecting free speech at home

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I write to you today as a patriotic American who is very concerned and troubled with the stifling of free speech on our nation's airwaves. How is it possible that entities such as Clear Channel Communications, which controls over twelve hundred radio stations in the U.S., openly sponsor pro-war rallies across the nation and censor the broadcast of peace songs and news reports relating to the war in Iraq that do not support their specific political agenda? Our laws recognize the dangers of monopolies in the commercial sector; over our airwaves the dangers and the stakes are immeasurably greater. I urge you to work for legislation that breaks up the control of these monopolies.

Yours truly,

Vera Zlatarski
337 E. 85th Street, #2A
New York, NY 10028
tel. 212-7178199 or 212-225-2148
fax 212-225-3999 or 212-693-9781

This message is being sent from a law firm and may contain information which is confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message and any attachments without retaining a copy.

From: Smith, Dianne
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/1/03 11:32AM
Subject: Duke Ownership Hearing

Commissioner Adelstein,

Thank you so much for your thoughtful comments and questions at yesterday's hearing. All of us in North Carolina really appreciate your attendance and the effort behind it.

Good luck with the Northwestern one and look forward to seeing you in Las Vegas!

Dianne

Dianne Smith
Special Projects Counsel
Capitol Broadcasting Co., Inc
Direct: (919) 821-8933
Fax: (919) 890-6095
dsmith@cbc-raleigh.com

2619 Western Blvd. 27606
Box 1200027605
Raleigh, North Carolina

From: Jeff Chester
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/2/03 6:35AM
Subject: Moyers to cover media ownership, FYI

NOW with Bill Moyers
April 4, 2003 at 9pm E.T. on PBS
(check local listings at <http://www.pbs.org/now/schedhtml>)

This week NOW with Bill Moyers presents a special one hour focus on the media and democracy.

Bill Moyers talks to Greg Mitchell about how the war in Iraq is being covered by the American media. Mitchell has edited several national magazines and written eight nonfiction books for major publishers and serves as editor of Editor & Publisher, the authoritative weekly magazine covering the newspaper industry in North America

As the FCC considers further deregulating corporate media, big media may get even bigger. NOW goes inside the debate over relaxing restrictions that could result in multi-billion dollar media conglomerates gaining more control over the nation's radio and television airwaves. Opponents of media consolidation fear that giving these giants a free pass to let the marketplace rule could severely affect the ability of journalists to be independent. If deregulation does take place, can democracy survive without the diversity of ideas presented by a truly free press?

And Bill Moyers reports on the stories not being covered by the news.

From: Susan Cain
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/3/03 8:50AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Susan Cain (SCain57088@aol.com) writes:

I am not easily motivated to protestations. Most of the time, I'm just too busy. And I've always had a strong belief that if I don't like what's on a particular radio station, I can just change the channel. I'm beginning to wonder. For a long time I've listened to a local radio station in Orlando, Cool 100. They play oldies and I like oldies. Simple enough. Since the war started, they have become the American equivalent of state run Iraqi television. I was going to make a complaint to the owners, Clear Channel. However, having visited the websites, it is obvious that the situation is not only condoned by Clear Channel but driven by them. I was going to contact the advertisers and inform them that I would be boycotting them if they continued to sponsor this mess. However, that doesn't look like a promising course of action when this company owns such a VAST MAJORITY of radio stations. I had no idea. Is there not some way to regulate the monopolization of our air waves?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.83.150.98
Remote IP address: 65.83.150.98

From: Tom Griego
 To: Commissioner Adelstein
 Date: 4/3/03 3:00PM
 Subject: The U.S. Dollar vs. The Euro

Mr. Adelstein,

As presented by our government and the media the purpose of the U.S. led war on Iraq is to free the Iraqi people from Saddam and return the country to its people. The protection of Americans (and the world) from WMDs is also presented as a key reason for going to war. However, there is another reason for this war, but it is never mentioned by any of the media. It is about the currency used to trade oil and consequently, who will dominate the world economically, in the foreseeable future – the USA or the European Union (EU).

America had a monopoly on the oil trade, with the US dollar being the fiat currency, but Iraq broke ranks in 1999, started to trade oil in the EU's euros, and profited. The American invasion of Iraq will lead directly to the removal of the EU and return the U.S. dollar as the fiat currency to trade Iraqi oil. This will make America's position as the dominant economic power in the world all but guaranteed.

The key to all this is the fiat currency for trading oil. If America did not stamp this economic threat immediately, it could lead to further use of the Euro as the currency of choice for trading oil, consuming the U.S. economy and its dominance of world trade.

An objective review of the world's economic forces at work today clearly places this as the primary reason why the U.S. is now in Iraq. Surely this deserves some air time if the media is to objectively report the facts.

To summarize, a primary reason for going to war with Iraq is to:

- Safeguard the American economy by returning Iraq to trading oil in US dollars, so the greenback is once again the exclusive oil currency.
- * Send a very clear message to any other oil producers just what will happen to them if they do not stay in the dollar circle.
- Place the second largest reserves of oil in the world under direct American control.

The American people need to know this. It should at least be presented as one of the reasons for going to war. This is example of why we need media diversity.

Thank You,
 Tom Griego

Phone: 310-234-4083
 Fax: 310-388-1421
 Email: griegotom@yahoo.com

From: David Hu
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/3/03 6:56PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

David Hu (davidhu18@yahoo.com) writes:

Hi Mr Adelstein,

I'm writting a report for one of my classes and I'm missing a key bit of information that I thought you might have. I was wondering if you could tell me the average length of **US** mobile phone **calls**. If not, could you point me in the right direction?

Much appreciated,
Dave

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.173.58.130
Remote IP address: 64.173.58.130

From: Rob Meyer
 To: NANCY KUBIK, rrm.g85@alumni.brown.edu
 Date: 4/4/03 4:29PM
 Subject: Re: NPR

I didn't quite get the instructions, so I am sending it back, with cc's to those I think are interested. AND WRITE THE F.C.C. --they vote this month on total deregulation. Anyone with questions, zap me back! --RRM

NANCY KUBIK <KUBIK0883@msn.com> wrote:

Subject: Petition for Nat'l Public Radio

On NPR's Morning Edition last week, Nina Totenberg said that if the Supreme Court supports Congress, it is in effect the end of the National Public Radio (NPR), NEA & the Public Broadcasting System (PBS). PBS, NPR and the arts are facing major cutbacks in funding. In spite of the efforts of each station to reduce spending costs and streamline their services, some government officials believe that the funding currently going to these programs is too large a portion of funding for something which is seen as not worthwhile. The only way that our representatives can be aware of the base of support for PBS and funding for such programs is by making our voices heard.

Please add your name to this petition and forward it to friends who believe in what this stands for. This is for anyone who thinks NPR/PBS is a worthwhile expenditure of \$1.12/year of their taxes. This petition is ! being passed around the Internet and will be forwarded to the President and the Vice President of the United States. Please add your name to it so funding can be maintained for NPR, PBS, & the NEA.

If you prefer not to sign, please don't kill it. Send it to the Email address listed here:

wein2688@blue.univnorthco.edu

NOTE: It is preferable that you SELECT (highlight) the entirety of this letter and then COPY it into a new outgoing message, rather than simply forwarding it.

In your new outgoing message, add your name to the bottom of the list, then send it on. (Or do a SEND AGAIN.)

HOW TO SIGN & FORWARD: Do not reply to me. Please sign and forward to others to sign. This is being forwarded to several people at once to add their names to the petition.

DON'T WORRY ABOUT DUPLICATES. It won't matter if many people receive the same list as the names are being managed. If you sign, please forward to others.

If you happen to be the 150th, 200th, 250th, etc., signer of this petition, please forward a copy to:

wein2688@blue.univnorthco.edu This way we can keep

track of the lists and organize them.

1050) Herman Bieber, Kenilworth, NJ 07033

1051) Jennifer Gaden, Charlottesville, VA 22901

1052) Jill T. Payne, Charlottesville VA 22901
 1053) Charles B. Payne, Jr., Dayton, OH 45327
 1054) Beth A. Payne, Dayton, OH 45327
 1055) Ann Pinetree, Kerrville TX 78028
 1056) Joe Lam, Hunt, Tx 78024
 1057) Pete Cronquist, Channelview, Tx 77530
 1058) Terry Wells, Huntsville, TX
 1059) Julie Strong, Austin, TX, 78751
 1060) Stuart Strong, Austin, TX, 78751
 1061) Jane Stevenson, Phoenix, AZ 85028
 1062) Judy Rossetter, North Platte, NE 69101
 1063) Wanda Tunge, North Platte, NE 69101
 1064) Lisa Farniglietti, Steamboat Springs, CO 80477
 1065) Jack Gubanc, Oakton, VA 22124
 1066) James Talky, Nashville, TN 37212
 1067) Alan Rhody, Nashville, TN 37212
 1068) Bob Goldstone, Pegram TN 37143
 1069) Jordan Chassan, Nashville, TN 37216
 1070) Billy Block, Nashville, TN 37204
 1071) Mike Gormley, Los Angeles, Ca.
 1072) Howard Thompson, NY, NY.
 1073) David Thorpe, NY, NY
 1074) Michelle Ishay, NY, NY
 1075) Zoe Reiter, NY, NY
 1076) Jasmine Kosovic, Venice, CA
 1077) Cecily Rhett, Los Angeles, CA
 1078) John Akamine, Los Angeles, CA
 1079) Leslie Ishii, Los Angeles, CA
 1080) Mary R. Vogt, Los Angeles, CA
 1081) Lynn Cohen, Los Angeles, CA
 1082) Paul Cohen, Los Angeles, CA
 1083) Jeffrey Stanek, Bloomington, IN
 1084) Laura Jekel, Bloomington, IN
 1085) Jamila Tekalli, Bloomington, IN
 1086) Clovis Lark, Bloomington, IN
 1087) Antje Curry, Salt Lake City, Utah
 1088) Ingrid Sulich, Sedona, AZ
 1089) Herb Henderson, Cottonwood, AZ
 1090) ! Steve Gillam, Wrigghwood, CA
 1091) Karen W. O'Neil, Prescott, AZ
 1092) Nancy J. Matchett Kubik, Englewood, CO
 1093) Rob Meyer, Seattle, WA

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Tax Center - File online, calculators, forms, and more

CC: 'acluemailactivists@aclu-wa.org', Kathleen Abernathy, Legislative ACLU, Commissioner
 Adelstein, Brown Alumni, Nicholas Andrews, Maria Cantwell, Michael Copps, Mike Copps, Jay Inslee, KM
 KJMWEB, Rosemary McAuliffe, Patty Murray

From: Linda Stone
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/4/03 9:46PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Linda Stone (lr.stone@verizon.net) writes:

I applaud your interest in hearing from the public regarding changes to licensing regulations. The airwaves belong to the people, and we must protect the public interest in this matter. Thank you for advocating for our democratic principles.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 151.203.179.163
Remote IP address: 151.203.179.163

From: Dyan and Anthony Connolly
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/4/03 9:48PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Dyan and Anthony Connolly (theconnollys@ev1.net) writes:

We are seriously concerned with the proposed changes to FCC regulations that would **see** more mergers of TV stations. During this time of great world events, we need every voice and point of view. The benefits for this society are to understand the world and how we are perceived in it. That comes from independent news/TV stations. The deregulation your committee is considering could change so much in very dynamic times. Please review Jacksonville situation. Please hold more public hearings. Please bring to this our attention. Thank you. Many blessings.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 207.218.236.209
Remote IP address: 207.218.236.209

From: DBecerra
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/4/03 10:17PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

DBecerra(DBecerra_Boyaca1@CompuServe.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

Thank you very much for standing up for the little guy! Though, unfortunatley, we do not often enough hear about dedicated public servants like yourself, it is greatly appreciated when we do. Living in the media hearland. where choice is supposedly broader than other less served places, and finding that these choices have gotten even more restrained in spite of promises made (Iwon't go so far back as to mention the great new world promised with the brake up of the phone companies), we hope that will be fortified knowing that people such as yourself have our backing.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.192.87.137
Remote IP address: 216.192.87.137

From: Victor A Bowman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/4/03 10:55PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Victor A Bowman (vicbowman@hotmail.com) writes:

I just sent the following to the Chairman. I believe you do not support his position. Please make it clear to him how dangerous the position is. It starts to make the stealing of the presidency in Florida look like a minor event!

I have just watched the news about your pending rule allowing unlimited ownership.

Of course that news was NOT on one of the large networks/conglomerates!

You are proving what many of us feared was true, the Republicans care only about MEGA-BUSINESS

I think there is ALREADY too much consolidation for the health of our democracy

Please reconsider your position on this critical issue.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 216.126.204.22
Remote IP address: 216.126.204.22

From: Kay Bockman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/5/03 1:24AM
Subject: Freedom of the Press (People)

Dear Sir,

I have been following the FCC agenda, mostly via the Bill Moyers' "Now" television program on PBS. I am very disturbed by the implications of the concentration of ownership of the different media outlets in the country. Please write and tell me what we the citizens can do to make our voices heard by the Commission.

Thank you,
Mary Kay Bockman
Battle Ground, Washington

From: Charles Clark Bell
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 46/03 1:48AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Charles Clark Bell (bellcharles@msn.com) writes:

I am very concerned that the government and your agency has been bought and paid for by the highest bidders. A healthy democracy must be encouraged to have a variety of "points of view", diversity of opinions. The very fact that campaign contributions to office holders can have the effect of limiting a wide spectrum of media ownership is not in a democracy's best interest. You state that "the rules are outdated due to the fact that they were carved out before the Internet and cable were even in operation" (my interpretation). Revision, certainly, but wholesale selling out to a few wealthy and powerful conglomerates who are controlling the sources of information that people need to make reasonable decisions about their lives and their government is close to criminal behavior. In my area, Denver, Colorado. I have the choice of The Rocky Mountain News or the Denver Post which are published by the same organization. Sure it is cost effective to consolidate for investors to receive healthy dividends. It is not good for thinking people to have one philosophy behind all of the news that they are exposed to. This is true about TV, Newspapers, radio, etc. I beg you to think about the effect that you and your fellow commissioners have by not standing up for the principle of freedom of information. On a positive note, I commend the FCC for finally doing something about some of the filth that is in the media today.

FCC Levies Fines Against Detroit Shock-Jocks

In a rare move, the Federal Communications Commission on Thursday levied a \$27,500 fine (or "Notice of Apparent Liability") against Detroit radio station WKRK-FM for violating the federal broadcast indecency law.

The FCC fined the station's owner, Infinity Broadcasting, for "explicit and graphic sexual and excretory references" in material that aired on the station in January 2002 during what's known as "afternoon drive time."

Because the material was held to be "extremely lewd and vulgar," the FCC more than tripled its usual fine of \$7,000

The commission also said it would not hesitate to consider revoking the station's license, if the need arises in the future.

"(The action) means television and radio stations are now on notice that repeated violations of (the broadcast indecency law) may lead to the **loss** of their licenses," according to Pat McGrath, a spokesman for Morality in Media, a pro-decency organization which had been involved in the FCC action.

The action came on a 4-1 vote. FCC Commissioner Michael Copps dissented, but he did **so** only because the fine was, he said, "a financial slap on the wrist (that) does not adequately reflect the seriousness of the station's actions."

Copps also called on the FCC to hold a hearing immediately to determine whether WKRK-FM's license should be

revoked.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1

Remote host: 67.234.185.214

Remote IP address: 67.234.185.214

From: Lawrence E. Feldman
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/5/03 7:33AM
Subject: [Fwd: Re: RIAA Boycott and GuitaiTabs.com and Dmusic?]

Jon:

Are you following the news on the RIAA suing 4 college students? Between them and Clear Channel, music doesn't stand a chance. I'm just a guitar and violin player, but somebody ought to do something.

Thought you should see this. A grass roots political movement if there ever was one. I have ears (I know you do too). I am generally politically apathetic, but even this gets me going. Music and culture are getting destroyed through monopolization. The whole concept is antithetical to art. Fascist regimes hate free art.

Media consolidation fostering cultural diversity? How?

Anyway, food for thought. Doing any playing? I'm still trying to get a copy of the CNN replay of the Georgetown performance. It sounded great on TV. Blues Brother!

regards,
Larry Feldman
leflaw@leflaw.com
leflaw@dmusic.com
1-215-635-0997 h.
215 -885-3302 office
215-885-3303 fax

for your listening pleasure:

lef.dmusic.com
iriemon.dmusic.com
jalalabad.dmusic.com
music.dmusic.com
how about
yourband.dmusic.com?

Original Message -----

Subject: Re: RIAA Boycott and GuitarTabs.Com and Dmusic?
Date: Sat, 05 Apr 2003 07:14:46 -0800
From: "Lawrence E. Feldman" <leflaw@leflaw.com>
To: personal@guitartabs.com
CC: tech <tech@leflaw.net>, Bill Evans <thumbtack1348@cox.net>, tom barger <tomsong@earthlink.net>, hal <hal@hbpr.com>
References: <001701c2fb65\$2dfe62b0\$0200a8c0@mainpc>

I am a lawyer with much litigation experience against record companies, who decided that I had seen enough of their evil and wanted to do something about it. I also play several instruments (including guitar, of which I own about 40) and have performed and recorded, most recently at the Kennedy Center in January, 2003 with Lester Chambers of the Chambers Brothers. I am also familiar with your legal woes, having read of them at the time. I thought guitar tablature was a wonderful idea.

Remember the Real Book? I learned to play Ornithology on the violin that way; also five string banjo from Bill Keith, who wrote the famous

Earl Scruggs banjo tablature book, (which made \$500,000 in royalties as of 1980, the year I sued Scruggs (gulp!) in Keith v. Scruggs.) I know more about tablature than you thought, I bet.

I currently represent Lester in two class actions against the record industry on accounting, pensions and digital rights. I bought boycott-riaa.com from its owner, who still runs the site for me, so that it would not fold.

I also own Dmusic.com, having purchased it from Michael Ovitz . We have turned it into an independent digital music community, and Michelle Robertson of Mp3.com (Micheals' sister) is currently running it for me.

We have syndicated the back-end of dmusic.com so that our news feed appears on 5 or so websites. including boycott-riaa.com , gnutella.com (which we host) gnutellanews.com and a few others. We also host Blues Traveller, the Coasters, Lester Chambers, and a few others.

I agree with you. The events of this week are a turning point. Suing college students! These people are sick. We must rally the various disparate communities into action, including endorsement of politicians who agree with our positions, our own lobbying efforts, and other related tactics.

Boycott-riaa and guitartab definitely will work together on this.

What should we do next? I have copied this to a few other like minded individuals, and employees for follow up. I will also call you today.

regards,
Larry Feldman
leflaw@leflaw.com
leflaw@dmusic.com
1-215-635-0997 h.
215 -885-3302 office
215-885-3303 fax

for your listening pleasure:

1ef.dmusic.com
iriemon.dmusic.com
jalalabad.dmusic.com
music.dmusic.com

Peter Allen wrote:

>Hello,
>

>I am the webmaster of GuitarTabs.com and a longtime foe of those who
>consider themselves responsible for "enforcing" the copyrights of the

>recording industry (i.e. RIAA, NMPA. Harry Fox Association). In 1997, I was
>threatened with lawsuits by the Harry Fox Association and the Warner
>Chappell division of AOL Time Warner, Inc. (then just Time Warner, Inc.).
>They alleged that guitar tablature files, which display a graphical
>representation of an individual's "by-eat" interpretation of a song, were
>infringing upon their copyrights. I had no money and no liability
>protection, so I complied with their cease and desist order and removed the
>tablature files. I have recently incorporated my business and begun hosting
>lyrics-free versions of these tablature files, since their strongest
>argument against the tablature files were the fact that they included
>copyrighted lyrics.
>
>With that history of my site in mind, it should be easy for you to see how a
>relationship between our organizations would probably be both natural and
>mutually beneficial. I receive around 80,000 hits per day from
>approximately 20,000 different people around the world, 74% of whom report
>buying at least one music CD per month. That means that I reach almost 5.5
>million financial contributors to the recording industry each year. While I
>have no exact numbers to prove it, I can assert with great certainty that a
>reasonable majority of these people oppose the recent legal actions taken by
>the RIAA. With the right information, I believe a decent number of these
>people could be persuaded to reduce or eliminate their album purchases from
>RIM-protected artists.
>
>However, from reading your site, I am not quite sure if this is your motive.
>I am not quite sure exactly what you are boycotting, or by what method. I
>would appreciate it if you could give me some more information (and possibly
>post it on your site, or make it more apparent if it's already there)
>regarding what your recommended boycott techniques are. It is my opinion
>that all the political campaigning in the world isn't going to slow down an
>organization with as much political power as the RIAA has. Instead, we must
>hit them in their pocketbook, by boycotting artists and record labels who
>employ them to enforce copyrights. Eventually, the message will penetrate
>their prehistoric industry that filing lawsuits against their own customers
>is a bad idea, and that declining record sales are a result of their legal
>actions and not the file-sharing programs themselves.
>
>Anyway, I look forward to hearing from you with any additional information
>with which you might be able to supply me. Please feel free to contact me
>by email or phone; all of my contact information is in my signature. Thank
>you for your time and consideration.
>
>Peter Allen, President
>Allen Enterprises, Inc.
>Toll free: (866) 822-8450
>Mobile: (440) 668-2363
>peter@allenenterprises.biz
>
>
>
>
>
>
>